

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/657,612	09/08/2003	James A. Bolton	GRFT CTNG 1.2 US	9450	
37138 75	590 05/08/2006		EXAMINER		
THADDIUS J. CARVIS			PARKER, FREE	PARKER, FREDERICK JOHN	
102 NORTH KING STREET LEESBURG, VA 20176			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			1762		
			DATE MAIL ED: 05/08/2004	4	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				~
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/657,612	BOLTON ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Frederick J. Parker	1762	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apport	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence addres	is
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Depend for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be twill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from (6), cause the application to become ABANDON	ON. timely filed m the mailing date of this commu IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
1)⊠ 2a)⊟	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 A</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under the	s action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, p		rits is
Dispositi	on of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or			
Applicati	on Papers			
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 1.	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So tion is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.	
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureasee the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. Is have been received in Applica rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stag	je
2) Notice 3) Inform	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail I S) Notice of Informal 6) Other:)

Application/Control Number: 10/657,612

Art Unit: 1762

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

The amendments in response to the claim objections of the Previous Office Action are acknowledged and appreciated, and the Examiner withdraws the objections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The amendments in response to the 35 USC 112 rejections of the Previous Office Action are acknowledged and appreciated, and the Examiner withdraws the rejections.

The following was discovered during an update search prior to allowance.

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 4 of copending Application No. 10/795947.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because '947 teaches similar applying, drying, and applying wood-graining and drying steps,

Art Unit: 1762

except that it cites "sparingly" applying the graining coat which would have been an obvious variation to produce "a natural look" of some desired woods as required by instant claim 1; while relative spreading between texture recesses and surface is not explicitly cited in '947, since '947 requires "to replicate a predetermined wood color and provide darkening color to the texture recesses", such spreading would have been an obvious variation.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

3. Claim 1 remains patentable over the prior art for the reasons previously cited. Only the double patenting issue remains.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frederick J. Parker whose telephone number is 571/272-1426. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur. 6:15am -3:45pm, and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on 571/272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/657,612

Art Unit: 1762

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Frederick J. Parker Primary Examiner Art Unit 1762 Page 4

fjp